arXiv:hep-ph/0510288v2 24 Oct 2005

COULD SPIN-CHARGE SEPARATION BE THE SOURCE OF CONFINEMENT?

Antti J. Niemi

Department of Theoretical Physics, Uppsala University P.O. Box 803, S-75108, Uppsala, Sweden; Laboratoire de Mathematiques et Physique Theorique CNRS UMR 6083, Universite de Tours, Parc de Grandmont, F37200, Tours, France

Abstract. Yang-Mills gauge field with gauge group $SU(2)$ decomposes into a single charge neutral complex vector, and two spinless charged scalar fields. At high energies these constituents are tightly confined into each other by a compact $U(1)$ interaction, and the Yang-Mills Lagrangian describes the dynamics of asymptotically free massless gauge vectors. But in a low energy and finite density environment the interaction between the constituents can become weak, and a spin-charge separation may occur. We suggest that the separation between the spin and charge with the ensuing condensation of the charged scalars takes place when the Yang-Mills theory enters confinement. The confining phase becomes then surprisingly similar to the superconducting phase of a high-T_c superconductor.

INTRODUCTION

According to popular folklore color (quark) confinement follows from an electric version of the BCS mechanism. This proposal is based on an assumption that the confining string is an electric version of the Abrikosov vortex [1]

The Abrikosov vortex is present in a type-II superconductor, where electrons condense into Cooper pairs. It is a static string-like configuration along which an undamped magnetic field line penetrates into the superconducting material. When such a magnetic vortex line forms between static particles with opposite magnetic charges (if such particles exist) it leads to a confining force that increases linearly in distance between the particles.

But a magnetic vortex line does not lead to a confining force between static, electrically charged particles. For the confinement of electrically charged particles such as electrons, one needs vortex lines that conduct an electric field. However, the observation that magnetically charged point particles are confined by magnetic Abrikosov vortices provides an attractive picture for explaining the confinement of quarks: Suppose the confining string is an analog of an Abrikosov vortex and suppose the quarks have a charge which couples to the component of the Yang-Mills field that is conducted along the string. Then quark confinement can be explained in the same way as the confinement of magnetic point charges in type-II superconductors is explained by (magnetic) Abrikosov vortices.

The quarks couple to the Yang-Mills field minimally, in the same manner as electrons couple to Maxwell's field in QED. As a consequence the confining string must couple to quarks in a manner which is different from the coupling between an electron and an

Abrikosov vortex. Instead of a (nonabelian) magnetic field, the confining string must be a carrier of a (nonabelian) electric field, it must be an electric dual version of the Abrikosov vortex.

The BCS picture of quark confinement is consistent with the structure of N=2 and N=1 supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories [2]. In these theories we have elementary Higgs fields that can describe the Cooper pairing and condensation of magnetic monopoles. This leads to an electric dual version of the Meissner effect and to the ensuing confinement of (nonabelian) electrically charged particles such as quarks. This supersymmetry approach to confinement is intimately based on the existence and properties of the elementary Higgs fields, and confinement is basically a consequence of a relatively straightforward extension of the BCS theory.

But in order to implement the BCS picture in a pure Yang-Mills theory we first need to understand how to describe vortices in an appropriate magnetic condensate.

In all known physical scenarios where vortices are present, vorticity is supported by some kind of a medium. In ordinary liquids such as helium superfluids or water, a vortex is formed in a concrete material environment. In a spontaneously broken (gauge) theory vorticity is supported by a (material) condensation of the relevant order parameter.

But in a pure Yang-Mills theory there is no apparent medium, no elementary Higgs field that could condense. Since there are no known vortex configurations that are formed in the absence of a supporting medium, we have a fundamental problem in pure non-supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory: The formation of a confining string between quarks necessitates the introduction of a medium that carries vorticity. But there is no known mechanism how a medium could be constructed or described in a pure Yang-Mills theory.

In order to characterize a material environment that can support vorticity, we need some kind of a fundamental or effective (Higgs-like) field that can condense. In a pure Yang-Mills theory, the emergence of an effective Higgs field would mean that we can introduce some kind of a mechanism that leads to the formation of a condensation that consists of gluons. Since no such gluonic version of Cooper pair formation is known, we then either need to develop new concepts and structures for describing vorticity, or alternatively we need to explain how an effective Higgs field could arise from outside of the pure Yang-Mills theory.

The Abrikosov vortex in a type-II superconductor is supported by a condensate that consists of Cooper pairs of electrons. As a consequence it does not confine electrons, even though it can confine magnetically charged point particles. Thus it is unlikely that the Cooper pairing of quarks can lead to a confining force between quarks. In order to explain quark confinement by a version of the BCS formalism, one needs instead a Cooper pairing of (nonabelian) magnetically charged particles. This means the confining flux tube must arise from the Yang-Mills field, and it receives no contribution from the condensation of quarks into (colored) Cooper pairs.

In the wider context of the Standard Model it is intrinsically possible, but highly unlikely, that the Higgs field of the electro-weak sector could provide a condensate that also supports the confining string in the strong sector of the theory. At the moment there are no theoretical arguments that anything like this could happen. The confinement of quarks appears to be an intrinsic property of the strong sector of the theory, with no contribution from the electroweak sector. Furthermore, at the moment we do not

even have any experimental evidence that a fundamental electroweak Higgs exists. If it can not be found, we may well have a very similar problem in both the strong and electroweak sector of the standard model, the absence of a fundamental Higgs field that describes a condensate.

In a lattice formulation of Yang-Mills theory the problem of a fundamental Higgs field can be avoided, by placing a singular vortex line between the lattice sites. The finiteness of the lattice site then ensures the absence of singularities in the theory, at least as long as the lattice site is finite. But it remains to be explained how anything like this could be implemented in the continuum limit of the theory.

Finally, it could be that instead of a material vortex structure the confining string has an intrinsic string theory description. But in order to describe an intrinsic string, it is necessary to introduce additional structures that are beyond a pure Yang-Mills theory: The intrinsic string approach to confinement would involve hypothetical properties of the space-time that are at the moment unknown, besides that the pure Yang-Mills theory should emerge as a particular limit of the description.

Maybe 30 years of intense but unsuccesfull efforts by the theoretical community to construct a magnetic Cooper pair condensate in a pure Yang-Mills theory should be viewed as evidence that quark confinement can not be explained by the BCS formalism. In fact, we propose that there is no *a priori* reason why any version of the BCS formalism should explain confinement in a pure Yang-Mills theory, there is no evidence of any kind of magnetic Cooper pair formation. It could be that confinement in a pure, non-supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory is due to an as yet unidentified mechanism which is quite different from the BCS picture.

Curiously, a very similar problem is also present in high temperature superconductivity where the implementation of the BCS formalism has thus far also failed: there is no theoretical or experimental evidence that the electrons form Cooper pairs in superconducting cuprates [3]. While the Cooper pair formation can not be definitely excluded, and there may even be some experimental support for a Cooper pair formation, the lack of any clear evidence for electron condensation into Cooper pairs has led to new ways for describing high-T_c superconductivity. Curiously, the situation there is surprisingly similar to that in strong interaction physics:

In the case of strong interaction physics, Yang-Mills theory is widely accepted. Similarly, in the case of high temperature superconductivity there is a consensus that the materials can be described by a definite theory, the $t-J$ model. In analogy to Yang-Mills theory, in this model there are no fundamental or effective Higgs fields that could support vortex structures with the ensuing Meissner effect. Consequently, at the moment, there is no theoretical understanding how BCS formalism could be implemented to explain high-T superconductivity. This has led to speculations that maybe high temperature superconductivity is due to a mechanism which is fundamentally different from the BCS formalism.

Could it then be, that high temperature superconductivity in $t-J$ model has an origin which is similar to the origin of quark confinement in a Yang-Mills theory?

The lack of a Cooper pair in the $t-J$ model has led to a very interesting theoretical proposal which, if correct, has far reaching consequences to our understanding of the

fundamental structure of Matter. This proposal is based on the very radical idea [4], [3] that in the strongly correlated environment of cuprate superconductors an electron ceases to be a fundamental particle. Instead an electron is a bound state of two other particles, which are called spinon and holon. The spinon is a fermion that carries the spin degree of freedom of the electron. It does not directly couple to Maxwell's electrodynamics. The holon is a spinless, complex boson and it carries the electric charge of the electron. Under normal circumstances the spinon and holon are tightly bound into each other by a confining force, consistent with the observational fact that at high energies an electron behaves as a structureless point particle. But in the strongly correlated environment of cuprate superconductors the force between the spinon and holon could become weak, and a spin-charge separation may take place. A holon condensation can then provide a material environment that support vorticity, leading to the Meissner effect and an explanation of superconductivity [3].

FERMIONS

In order to outline the slave-boson decomposition of an electron we start from a four-dimensional Dirac spinor ψ_D^a. Here $a = 1,...,4$ label its four anticommuting components that obey the (graded) Poisson bracket

$$\{\psi_D^{a\dagger}(x), \psi_D^b(y)\} = \delta^{ab}(x-y) \tag{1}$$

We select the Weyl basis of the γ-matrices,

$$\gamma^\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma^\mu \\ \bar{\sigma}^\mu & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\sigma^0 = \bar{\sigma}^0$ is the 2×2 unit matrix, and $\sigma^i = -\bar{\sigma}^i$ $(i = 1,2,3)$ are the standard Pauli matrices. In this basis we represent the Dirac fermion as

$$\psi_D = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\alpha \\ \chi^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}$$

where ξ_α and $\chi^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}}$ (with $\alpha, \dot{\alpha} = 1,2$) are two-component Weyl fermions. The spinor indices are raised and lowered using the antisymmetric tensors $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\varepsilon^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}}$ with non-vanishing components determined by setting $\varepsilon^{12} = \varepsilon_{21} = 1$. Explicitely, we have *e.g.* $\xi^\alpha = \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\xi_\beta$ and $\chi^\dagger_{\dot{\alpha}} = \varepsilon_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}}\chi^{\dagger\dot{\beta}}$. Furthermore, when we introduce the conjugate variables $\chi^\dagger_\alpha = (\sigma_0)_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}\chi^{\dagger\dot{\beta}}$ and $\xi^{\dot{\alpha}} = (\bar{\sigma}_0)^{\dot{\alpha}\beta}\xi_\beta$ we get the graded Poisson brackets

$$\{\chi^\alpha(x), \chi^\dagger_\beta(y)\} = \delta^\alpha{}_\beta(x-y) \quad \& \quad \{\xi^\dagger_{\dot{\alpha}}(x), \xi^{\dot{\beta}}(y)\} = \delta_{\dot{\alpha}}{}^{\dot{\beta}}(x-y) \tag{2}$$

The relativistic version of the slave-boson decomposition is obtained by setting

$$\chi^\alpha = \mathrm{b}^\dagger \cdot f^\alpha + \varepsilon^{\alpha\gamma} f^\dagger_\gamma \cdot \mathrm{d} \tag{3}$$

For the right-handed Weyl spinor $\xi^\dagger_{\dot\alpha}$ we introduce an analogous decomposition, but here we do not need to display it explicitely. Here b and d are bosonic fields, they are the *holons* and subject to the Poisson brackets

$$\{\,\mathrm{b}^\dagger(x),\mathrm{b}(y)\,\}=\{\,\mathrm{d}^\dagger(x),\mathrm{d}(y)\,\}=\delta(x-y)$$

The f_α is an anticommuting (left-handed) Weyl spinor. It is the *spinon* and it obeys the graded Poisson bracket

$$\{f^\alpha(x),f^\dagger_\beta(y)\}\;=\;\delta^\alpha{}_\beta(x-y)$$

As a consequence, when we substitute the slave-boson decomposition (3) in (2), we find that the decomposed Weyl fermion χ^α obeys the graded Poisson bracket

$$\{\chi^\alpha(x),\chi^\dagger_\beta(y)\}==\delta^\alpha{}_\beta(x-y)\cdot\{f^\gamma f^\dagger_\gamma+\mathrm{b}^\dagger\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{d}^\dagger\mathrm{d}\}$$

We also verify that

$$\{\chi^\alpha(x),\chi^\beta(y)\}=0$$

Thus the decomposed field (3) reproduces the entire Poisson bracket structure of the original Weyl fermion χ^α provided we introduce the constraint

$$N=f^\gamma f^\dagger_\gamma+\mathrm{b}^\dagger\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{d}^\dagger\mathrm{d}=1 \tag{4}$$

With this constraint, the decomposition (3) then becomes an operator identity.

More generally, we can set

$$N=f^\gamma f^\dagger_\gamma+\mathrm{b}^\dagger\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{d}^\dagger\mathrm{d}=\mu \tag{5}$$

where μ is some function. It can be selected arbitrarily, with the sole condition that $\mu(x)$ is non-vanishing for *all x*. This ensures that the resulting Poisson brackets of the decomposed fermion χ^α continue to define a graded symplectic two-form. The only difference between (4) and (5) is, that when $\mu\neq 1$ the decomposed fermions are graded canonical variables which are not of the Darboux form.

The condition (4), and its more general version (5), can be interpreted as the statement that for a separation between spin and charge, the fermionic system must be in a physical environment with a finite density, and the density is determined by the function $\mu(x)$. If this density vanishes for some *x*, the Poisson brackets of the decomposed fermion fail to reproduce the symplectic structure of the original fermion, and a spin-charge separation can not occur. In particular, for all fields $b,\ d,\ f$ to have well defined Poisson brackets so that they can be dynamical, each of the number densities $b^\dagger b$, $d^\dagger d$, $f^\alpha f^\dagger_\alpha$ must be nonvanishing: An isolated electron can not become decomposed into its spin and charge consituents, for a separation we need a material finite density environment.

Both the holons b and d and the spinon f_α are complex fields. Consequently the decomposition (3) has an internal local $U(1)$ symmetry, the Weyl fermion χ^α in (3) remains intact when we send

$$\mathrm{b}\to e^{i\theta}\mathrm{b}\quad\&\quad\mathrm{d}\to e^{i\theta}\mathrm{d}\quad\&\quad f^\alpha\to e^{i\theta}f^\alpha \tag{6}$$

We note that this symmetry is generated by the canonical Poisson bracket action of the number operator N in (4). It is a *compact* $U(1)$ symmetry, that leads to an interaction between the holons and spinons. For a large value of its coupling, a compact $U(1)$ interaction is known to be confining. Thus we expect that (6) in general leads to an interaction between the spinons and holons which in a non-material environment where μ vanishes confines them into the (pointlike) fermion.

Conventionally, we couple Maxwell's eletromagnetism to the canonical charge operator defined by

$$Q = \chi^{\alpha}\chi^{\dagger}_{\alpha}$$

When we compute the canonical Poisson bracket action of Q on the Weyl spinor χ^{α} using the decomposed representation (3), we get from (5)

$$\{Q(x), \chi^{\alpha}(y)\} = N(x)\cdot\chi^{\alpha}(x)\delta(x-y) \;=\; \mu(x)\cdot\chi^{\alpha}(x)\delta(x-y)$$

This states that $\mu(x)$ coincides with the local charge density at x. Clearly, this canonical action of Q on the decomposed spinor can be reproduced by the canonical action of

$$\bar{Q} = -\mu(x)\cdot[\mathrm{b}^{\dagger}\mathrm{b} - \mathrm{d}^{\dagger}\mathrm{d}]$$

This confirms that the holons b and d become (oppositely) charged under the standard coupling of a Weyl fermion to Maxwellian electromagnetism, while the spinon f^{α} is electrically neutral. Thus the spinless holons indeed carry the entire electric charge of the Weyl (Dirac) fermion while its entire spin is carried by the charge neutral spinon.

In the ultraviolet, individual fermions such as quarks and leptons behave like structureless point particles. Consequently in the ultraviolet region there must be a very strong confining interaction between their holon and spinon constituents. This is consistent with the verity, that the β-function of an abelian gauge theory such as the compact $U(1)$ interaction between holons and spinons should not display asymptotic freedom in the ultraviolet limit. Instead, it is natural to expect that the internal $U(1)$ interaction becomes strongly coupled and confining when we approach the ultraviolet limit. Thus the present slave-boson decomposition of a Dirac (Weyl) fermion is consistent with the experimental observation that at high energies and low densities elementary particles such as leptons and quarks behave asymptotically as structureless point particles.

But at low energy scales it is feasible that a compact $U(1)$ theory becomes weakly coupled. In an infrared environment where the constraint (4) is obeyed, a Weyl fermion may then become split into its independent holon and spinon constituents. It has been proposed [4], [3] that for an electron such a decomposition could take place in strongly correlated cuprate superconductors. The (d-wave) high-T_c superconductivity can then emerge in a phase where a spinon pairing becomes accompanied by a holon condensation,

$$< b > \neq 0$$

with a consequential spontaneous breaking of the internal $U(1)$ symmetry.

It is conceivable, that a slave-boson decomposition of a (relativistic) fermion could also occur in environments such as Early Universe when the density was very large, or in the interior of hadronic matter when energies are not very high. In these high

density environments the number operators for the holons and spinons are presumably nonvanishing which implies that the ensuing Poisson brackets are nontrivial so that both spinons and holons can become dynamical physical degrees of freedom.

In order to test the relevance of the slave-boson decomposition in a given physical scenario, one needs in addition to substitute the decomposed fermion into the corresponding Hamiltonian. One can then verify whether or not the spinons and holons can indeed describe propagating degrees of freedom in the environment of interest, in a normal manner. In the case of the $t-J$ model, under conditions that are supposed to describe high-T_c superconductivity, the decomposed Hamiltonian does admit a natural intrepretation in terms of holons and spinons as particle-like excitations. This suggests, that a separation between spin and charge may take place. The theoretical and physical consequences of this scenario have been discussed widely in the literature and we refer to [3] for details.

GAUGE FIELDS

We are curious, whether a similar separation between spin and charge could also occur in the case of a Yang-Mills theory, and whether this could lead to an understanding of confinement [5], [6], [7]. For simplicity we shall only consider a pure $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory in a four dimensional space R^4 with Euclidean signature. But a generalization to more general gauge group $SU(N)$ in a Minkowskian signature space is straightforward.

We represent the gauge field as a linear combination

$$A_\mu = A_{\mu i}\sigma^i = C_\mu \sigma^3 + X_{\mu +}\sigma^+ + X_{\mu -}\sigma^- \tag{7}$$

where $\sigma^\pm = 1/2(\sigma^1 \pm i\sigma^2)$ and

$$X_{\mu\pm} = A_{\mu 1} \mp iA_{\mu 2}$$

Our slave-boson decomposition of A_μ entails a decomposition of $X_{\mu\pm}$ into its spin and charge constituents. For this, we introduce a complex vector field e_μ which we normalize according to

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \vec{e}^2 & = & 0 \\ \vec{e}\cdot\vec{e}^* & = & 1 \end{array} \tag{8}$$

With ψ_1 and ψ_2 two complex scalars we can then write $X_{\mu\pm}$ as [5]

$$X_{\mu +} = X^*_{\mu -} = i\psi_1 e_\mu - i\psi_2^* e_\mu^* \tag{9}$$

Indeed, *any* four component complex vector can always be represented as a linear combination of the form (9). For this, it suffices to observe that an arbitrary, unconstrained four component complex vector describes eight independent real field degrees of freedom. On the other hand, the two complex fields ψ_1 and ψ_2 describe four, and the complex vector $\vec{e}$ when subject to the conditions (8) describes five independent field degrees

of freedom. But one of these corresponds to the internal $U(1)$ rotation

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \vec{e} & \longrightarrow & e^{-i\xi}\vec{e} \\ \psi_1 & \longrightarrow & e^{i\xi}\psi_1 \\ \psi_2 & \longrightarrow & e^{i\xi}\psi_2 \end{array} \tag{10}$$

which leaves the *r.h.s.* of (9) intact. As a consequence, in the general case the *r.h.s.* of (9) also describes eight independent field degrees of freedom.

For simplicity, we may assume that the off-diagonal components $X_{\mu\pm}$ are subject to the maximal abelian gauge condition

$$D^{ij}_{\mu}[C]X_{\mu j} = (\partial_\mu \mp iC_\mu)X_{\mu\pm} \stackrel{def}{=} D^{\pm}_{\mu}X_{\mu\pm} \tag{11}$$

However, we shall not impose any condition on the diagonal component C_μ. As a consequence the gauge condition (11) removes two of the gauge degrees of freedom in A_μ. This leaves us with a $U(1) \in SU(2)$ gauge invariance, which corresponds to gauge transformations in the Cartan direction of $SU(2)$. Indeed, when we specify

$$g \to h = e^{i\omega\sigma^3} \tag{12}$$

we get

$$C_\mu\sigma^3 + X_{\mu+}\sigma^+ + X_{\mu-}\sigma^- \stackrel{h}{\longrightarrow} (C_\mu + 2\partial_\mu\omega)\sigma^3 + e^{2i\omega}X_{\mu+}\sigma^+ + e^{-2i\omega}X_{\mu-}\sigma^- \tag{13}$$

while the condition (11) clearly remains intact.

When the $X_{\mu\pm}$ are subject to the condition (11), in the representation (9) there are *a priori* restrictions both on the scalars ψ_1 and ψ_2, and on the vector $\vec{e}$. But we now argue that (11) can be naturally interpreted as a restriction solely on the absolute values ρ_1 and ρ_2 of the complex fields ψ_1 and ψ_2. Indeed, consider the functional

$$\int d^4\, x X_{\mu+}X_{\mu-} \;=\; \int d^4x\,(|\psi_1|^2 + |\psi_2|^2) \;=\; \int d^4x(\rho_1^2 + \rho_2^2) \tag{14}$$

This is manifestly invariant under the abelian gauge transformation (13). But if we subject the *unconstrained* $X_{\mu\pm}$ to an arbitrary infinitesimal $SU(2)$ gauge transformation and demand that (14) remains stationary, the ensuing Euler-Lagrange equation coincides with the maximal abelian gauge condition [8]

$$\delta_g \int d^4x X_{\mu+}X_{\mu-} = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; (\partial_\mu \mp iC_\mu)X_{\mu\pm} \;\equiv\; D^{\pm}_{\mu}X_{\mu\pm} = 0$$

Notice that the functional (14) involves only the two absolute values ρ_1 and ρ_2. Since the Euler-Lagrange equation *i.e.* the maximal abelian gauge condition (11) gives two independent conditions, we can use it to solve for the two absolute values ρ_1 and ρ_2 in terms of the other variables. In the maximal abelian gauge (11) both of the ρ_1 and ρ_2 then acquire their (gauge invariant) extrema values along the $SU(2)$ gauge orbit.

We observe, that when we use the condition (11) and solve for ρ_1 and ρ_2, we introduce *no* restrictions on the complex vector $\vec{e}$. Nor do we introduce any restrictions on the

phases of the complex fields ψ_1 and ψ_2. In particular, this means that the internal symmetry (10) remains intact when we evaluate the absolute values ρ_1 and ρ_2 at their gauge invariant extrema along the gauge orbit.

We note that in general there are Gribov ambiguities in the maximal abelian gauge condition. Consequently the extrema values of ρ_1 and ρ_2 on the orbit are not unique. Here we will not analyze the consequences that Gribov ambiguities might have.

The diagonal $U(1) \subset SU(2)$ gauge transformation (13) acts on the complex fields $\psi_{1,2}$ as follows,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \psi_1 & \rightarrow & e^{2i\omega}\psi_1 \\ \psi_2 & \rightarrow & e^{-2i\omega}\psi_2 \end{array} \tag{15}$$

Here the phases differ from those in (10) by a relative sign. Since this $U(1)$ transformation leaves the vector $\vec{e}$ intact, only the complex fields ψ_1 and ψ_2 couple to the Cartan subgroup $U(1) \subset SU(2)$. On the other hand, the components e_μ transform as a vector under Lorenz transformations while the fields ψ_1 ad ψ_2 are scalars. This means that (9) entails a decomposition of $X_{\mu\pm}$ into two qualitatively very different sets of fields: The scalar fields ψ_1 and ψ_2 couple nontrivially to the abelian component of the $SU(2)$ gauge transformations *i.e.* carry a charge but have no spin. The complex vector $\vec{e}$ is neutral *w.r.t.* the abelian component of the gauge transformation but it carries the spin degrees of freedom of the $X_{\mu\pm}$.

As in the fermionic case, for consistency of the decomposition (9) we must assume that *both* condensates $\rho_{1,2}$ are nontrivial. This means, that for a spin-charge decomposition to occur in the quantum Yang-Mills theory we need *both* expectation values

$$< \rho_{1,2} >= \Delta_{1,2} \tag{16}$$

to be nonvanishing. This condition then specifies the *material* environment where the separation between the spin and the charge of a gauge field can occur.

It is apparent that the present slave-boson decomposition of the gauge field is fully analogous to the slave-boson decomposition of the Dirac (Weyl) fermion: In both cases, the decomposition entails a separation between the carriers of spin, and the carriers of charge. Furthermore, in both cases the separation can only occur in a finite density environment. In the case of a fermion we need the μ in (5) to be non-vanishing and in the case of gauge field we need the condensates (16) to be non-vanishing. Furthermore, in both cases the decomposition introduces an internal, compact $U(1)$ that can be employed to argue that asymptotically in the short distance limit both the gauge field and the fermion become structureless point particles, with the spinon and holon confined to each other by the strong internal force. The internal spin-charge structures can then be visible only in the infrared region and in a finite density environment, when the internal $U(1)$ interaction becomes weak.

In analogy with high-temperature superconductivity, it becomes natural to propose that confinement in $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory is described by a a phase where spin-charge separation occurs and *both* condensates (16) are nonvanishing, with the ensuing vortices describing the confining strings. There are tentative numerical results [7], obtained by analysing the London limit of the Yang-Mills quantum theory, that indicate that confinement can indeed be related to the non-vanishing of *both* order parameters (16).

But until now, no serious lattice results have been presented to test this proposal. Such a serious lattice simulation would not only test whether the holon condensation could relate to confinement. It would also test the fundamental structure of Matter, whether the known elementary particles could indeed be composites of more fundamental constituents that describe their independent spin and charge degrees of freedom.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Ludvig Faddeev for various discussions and collaboration that led to the development of the ideas presented here. I also wish to thank the organizers of the *QCD@Work* 2005 for giving me an opportunity to present my results. I also wish to thank the Universities of Kyoto and Tokyo, and APCTP for hospitality during this work. This research has been supported by a VR Grant and by a STINT Thunberg scholarship.

REFERENCES

1. R.W. Haymaker, Phys. Rept. **315** (1999) 153; M. N. Chernodub and M. I. Polikarpov, in *Confinement, Duality and Non-Perturbative Aspects of QCD* (Plenum Press, New York, 1998)
2. N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B426** (1994) 19
3. P.A. Lee, N. Nagaosa and X.-G. Wen, `cond-mat/0410445`
4. P.W. Andersson, Science **235** (1987) 1196; L.D. Faddeev and L. Takhtajan, Phys. Lett. **A85** (1981) 375
5. L.D. Faddeev and A.J. Niemi, Phys. Lett. **B525** (2002) 195; Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 1624
6. A.J. Niemi, JHEP 0408 (2004) 035
7. A.J. Niemi and N. Walet, Phys. Rev. **D72** (2005) 054007; see also M. Chernodub, `hep-th/0506107`
8. F.V. Gubarev, L.Stodolsky and V.I. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 2220